School of Theology at Claremont
10011462597

BX
5034
M35
1948

The Library
of the
CLAREMONT
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

1325 North College Avenue
Claremont, CA 91711-3199
1/800-626-7820

A CHARGE

DELIVERED AT

THE ORDINARY VISITATION

OF THE

ARCHDEACONRY OF CHICHESTER

IN JULY, 1848.

BY

HENRY EDWARD MANNING, M.A.,

ARCHDEACON OF CHICHESTER.

LONDON:

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

AND W. H. MASON, CHICHESTER.

1848.

LIBRARY
CLAREMONT SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
1325 N. COLLEGE AVE.
CLAREMONT, CA 91711-3199

London: Printed by William Clowes and Sons, Stamford Street.

BX
5034
.M35
1948

TO

THE REVEREND

THE RURAL DEANS,

AND

THE CLERGY,

OF

THE ARCHDEACONRY OF CHICHESTER,

This Charge

IS INSCRIBED

WITH THE GRATEFUL THANKS OF THEIR AFFECTIONATE
BROTHER AND SERVANT,

H. E. M.

A CHARGE,

&c. &c.

My Reverend Brethren,

After so long an absence, and during a season so teeming in new and strange events, it is but natural that there should be subjects of no common moment, on which I would pray you for a while to bear with me. Not, indeed, that I hope to add anything to your previous thoughts and judgments, nor that I attach importance to anything that I may have to say; but for so many years we have both lived and worked together with a free and kindly confidence, founded upon a clear and open avowal of convictions, that it would be new and unnatural if I were not to speak with our habitual plainness of the events which have befallen us in the last twelve months. It is due to you: it is also due to myself; because in the last year,—a season of no little public anxiety,—by the will of God, I have been far away, and unable to share, even by a word, in the decisions and acts which you have taken. I feel, therefore, that in coming back once more to

labour among you and with you, according as God is pleased to help me, I cannot take my place again without uniting myself with you by a full and earnest expression of concurrence in the steps that you have pursued. And at what time, or in what manner, can I better do so than this day, when we assemble again, after so long a time, at our first official meeting in Visitation?

One, and one only, act it was in my power, at so great a distance, to share; and that was to attach my name, by the hand of another, to a formal document lately delivered to the Metropolitan of this province. It seemed to me a duty so far to hold myself clear from partaking, even by silence or construction, in a course of events full, as it appeared, of the gravest evils: and to reserve thereby a liberty of judgment to review, if it should please God to give the occasion, and to make it, therefore, a duty, the whole series of those events in their bearing upon ourselves.

In speaking of them, at this time, it is not my object, God knoweth, to renew discussions which are now allayed; still less to widen breaches which have been unhappily opened. It is my desire simply to estimate the facts as they stand completed, and to treat them in the only form in which they now possess importance; that is, as practical questions. What I say, therefore, will, after all, have less reference to the past than to the future; and I shall touch upon the past only as it is the subject-matter which imposes

the necessity of future action. Moreover, I wish to speak not of persons, but of principles; because persons are only for a day, principles are for ever. Nevertheless, as in touching upon events and acts it is impossible not to implicate the persons engaged, I desire, farther, to say one word at the outset. My hope and belief is that the several parties engaged in transactions to which I may allude, were persuaded that both in the end they had in view, and in the means they employed to attain it, they were pursuing a clear line of duty. Unless we cherish this conviction even as to persons most directly opposed to us, I do not know how we shall escape sinning against the grace of Charity. Nothing but plain evidences of malice or bad faith will be accepted as sufficient, by those who desire to make the law of love their rule of life, to convict opponents of malign intentions. Evil as this world is, there is less of deliberate ill intention than we impute. Conduct the most indefensible on our own principles, may, in another, follow by direct inference from some erroneous premiss, some inverted or imperfect maxim invincibly and sincerely believed to be a first form of truth, or a first law of right. This is no defence of error; it does but plead that upright men may err. Intellectual obscurity, imperfect judgment, inconsequence of reasoning, false persuasions arising from birth, early education, habitual belief, will explain most of the contests which are

passing among ourselves. This way of treating opponents does not lead to latitudinarian vagueness, or to light esteem of truth and right. It has nothing at all to do with truth or right as such, but only with the persons with whom we may be contending. It prescribes the law of our dealings one with another, while we still love and revere both Truth and Right as changeless and eternal. Surely this is but the Sermon on the Mount, the precept of our Lord, to whom alone belongs all judgment; who, therefore, warns us, "Judge not, that ye be not judged." I have said this more at length because I am deeply persuaded that, in the late contests, there are on both sides men of whose truth I have as full an assurance as of my own, and of whose goodness I have a deeper conviction.

With these remarks I will go on to speak of the recent appointment to the see of Hereford.

Taking this case as a whole, we may begin by distinguishing between the question as to the doctrinal opinions of the Right Reverend person appointed to that see, and the question as to the manner in which his consecration was effected.

Into the former point I think it is no longer our duty to enter.

First, because the Church, as such, has never passed judgment on the theology of Dr. Hampden. He has never been cited and judged before any Consistory or tribunal of the Church. Whatever his

opinions may be, they are, therefore, unascertained by any authoritative ecclesiastical decision.

Secondly, the censure of the University of Oxford in the year 1836 did not pronounce his doctrine to be heretical, or to savour of heresy, or to be scandalous, or to be offensive to pious ears and the like It did not specify or characterise the nature of its unsoundness according to the definitions of ecclesiastical usage. It declared in terms just and grave indeed as a censure, but wholly informal and imperfect as a judgment, that he had "so treated theological matters that, in this respect, the University had no confidence in him."* So that there exists no formal decision of any tribunal at all, ecclesiastical or even academical, stamping the doctrine of Dr. Hampden with a specific character of heterodoxy.

Thirdly, it is just to record that from the date of that censure no new matter of exception has been alleged. The teaching of the party censured has not been again questioned, so far as I know, on any point of faith.

Fourthly, on a late occasion when proceedings for the trial of this doctrinal question were brought before the proper authority, that authority, after deliberation, determined to proceed no farther. The importance of this event in one way is great. As a matter of fact the trial of the doctrinal question has never been brought before any tribunal of the Church.

* "Ita res theologicas tractaverit, ut in hac parte nullam ejus fiduciam habeat Universitas."

At the moment when it was on the point of appearing it was suffered to pass through. Various judgments have been formed of this fact. I must regard it as one of those events from which no tribunal and no judge, civil or ecclesiastical, is secure. The whole course of human justice is chequered by like imperfections of procedure. Whether by the application of wrong principles, or by the misapplication of right, it ever has happened, and ever will, that the course of external jurisdiction will imperfectly represent and apply the internal law of justice.

Up to this moment, then, the party accused has never been condemned by any tribunal of the Church. He is, therefore, on the ground familiar to us in the common equity which ought to temper all judgment, to be regarded as a person on whom no conviction has passed. We may not take the law into our own hands, nor impose on our individual responsibility, how clear soever the proof may seem, the note which the proper judge, through error of practice or failure to proceed, has not imposed. In one word, the duty is not ours, or rather it is our duty not so to do. As, in the eye of civil law, a man is innocent till he be lawfully found guilty, so, and even more in spiritual discipline, it has been held—with a breadth which strains the rule, at times, too far—that notoriety needs legal form to deprive a member of the Church of spiritual rites and offices. In matters of theological teaching where the judg-

ment is more difficult, even a greater caution from private persons is required. Until, therefore, any member of the Church be judicially pronounced by a proper tribunal to be unsound, he ought to be publicly treated as orthodox. No man is a heretic to us who is not a heretic to the Church; and no man is to the Church a heretic but one who has been condemned *in foro exteriori* for heresy. This does not hinder us from using all means, as it was our duty to do in this case, to obtain a full examination of suspicious teaching, nor of protesting against acts which ought only to follow upon such inquiry; but when, through error, such acts are finally completed, individuals may rest within the sphere of their responsibility. They can do no more, and are therefore free.

Again: it is not only possible, but it is just, to use this equity of individual judgment; because, at various, and some of them most solemn times—as at the moment of consecration—the Right Reverend person, of whom we speak, declared his acceptance of the whole doctrine of Faith. He was consecrated, not upon the confession of his theological works, but on public subscription of the Catholic creeds. Sincere subscription, thereby condemning all heresies, is all that has ever been required to reinstate any, howsoever compromised by heterodoxy, in the peace of the Church.* Of subscription the fact of consecration is our pledge; of sincerity who dares conceive a

* History of the Arians, pp. 274, 275.

doubt? For these reasons it appears that we are now released from the necessity of forming opinions as to past theological statements, justly censured. We may accept the last public subscription as a fact closing up a retrospect which nothing but new necessity can re-open.

No one, surely, can have lived in the study of Truth without feeling, even year by year, that his past thoughts are faint and inadequate; his past words either too narrow or too large, too peremptory or too doubtful. And yet the Faith is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. And our conceptions of it are formally the same: but they have gained in intensity or in extension, in the light which comes from love, or in the reality which springs from adoration of the uncreated Truth. And as we enter more deeply into the eternal objects of Faith, so we find that our past words have been but a stammering tongue: that we have been speaking we wist not what: that when we have been choosers of our own words we have said too little or too much: that we have seldom spoken with severe truth and fearless certainty except in the traditional language of the Church. So to the end of life we shall go on, ever beginning to prize our birthright at its true inestimable worth: holding sacred the "jot" and the "tittle" which "shall not pass away;" counting more dear than life an iota for which St. Athanasius did not fear to divide the world.

With this view and upon these reasons, forgetting the past, and with a fervent trust that the future to which, under God, we commit ourselves, may bear out our hope, let us leave the question of doctrine.

We come now to the manner in which that Right Reverend person was consecrated.

The only point of real importance in this part of the question I conceive to be the act of the Commissary of the Metropolitan in refusing to hear objectors whom he had duly cited, and in proceeding, nevertheless, to confirm the election presented to him.

These unreasonable and irregular proceedings might be dismissed as a simple error, committed by a Court, the practice of which, through desuetude or infrequency of exercise, may be dubious or unascertained. But it has acquired a graver import from the fact that, in the Court of Queen's Bench, these proceedings of the Ecclesiastical Court were justified by the Law Officers of the Crown; and that the Civil Court thereupon refused to interfere.

The case, therefore, assumes the form of a claim, set up in behalf of the Crown, to a power absolute and unlimited in the choice of persons to be recommended for election as Bishops, without submitting the fitness of the person elect, according to the law of the Universal Church, to any Judge or Tribunal whatsoever. Formidable as this claim appears, the law and the right of the case are, surely, beyond all

controversy. Nothing can be wanting but a calm review to establish the contradiction of this pretension.

As to the past, let it be granted that the person designated was elected, confirmed, and consecrated: that the errors committed were in matter of form: that the essential acts were completed, so that, the Church tacitly accepting, there need be no question of validity. We may say "factum valet, ita fieri non debuit." But looking to the future it may not so easily be suffered to pass. It has raised a question of principles which must be truly and justly solved. From this we cannot recede.

And, first, let us lay down the principles of the question.

It is evident:—

1. That the Apostolic Office with the power of succession was given by our Lord to the Apostles alone.*

2. But the power of succession involves both the choice of the persons to be ordained, and the admission of them by ordination to the Apostolic office: so that by the original grant the electors and the consecrators were the same persons: that is, the College of the Apostles. And this is obvious on a moment's thought. The sole power to consecrate or ordain, all admit to have been in the Apostles alone.

* Thomass. de Vet. et Nov. Eccles. Disc., P. ii. lib. ii. c. 1.

And, therefore, be the electors who they might, no man could be ordained without their approval. The power to refuse ordination is in fact the power to elect: an unlimited veto is ultimately supreme; and the acceptance of a person elected is a judicial approval of his fitness.

3. When, therefore, we find in the first and sixth chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, that the brethren or people choose or joined in choosing the persons for ordination, it is evident that the acceptance of those persons by the Apostles was a judicial approval of the election. Howsoever the functions and ministries of the Church may be distributed, they are nevertheless acts of the whole body of the faithful, "fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth."* But in this united procedure there are three very distinct parts: the election of the person, the judicial approval of the election, and the ordination of the elect.

It is plain from the course of ecclesiastical history, as well as from the reason of the case, that the privilege of election has been intrusted, and—according to circumstances and times—may very safely be intrusted to any member or members of the Church.

Though it be essentially in the Apostolic order, yet the Apostles invited the Christian people at large to share it. After the first times the election of Bishops

* Ephes. iv. 16.

was in the people and the Clergy,* or in the Clergy of the diocese at large, or in the Clergy by representation, that is, by the Chapter† of the Cathedral Church; then it passed into the privilege of Princes, who thereby became proxies of the whole Church within their realm, and chiefly of the lay people. Sometimes it was in the hands of an individual of note, as in an instance not long extinct among ourselves.

Now it is evident that it matters comparatively little who shall choose the person if the person be fit, and his fitness truly ascertained by the Church. Indeed as to the prerogative of recommending a person for election, without saying whether or no it is abstractedly the best form of procedure, it is one of almost universal acceptance, and in close analogy with the genius of Christian kingdoms and of the social order of Christian civilization. It is well known that, in all countries of Europe, the nomination of Bishops has been for ages in the hands of Sovereigns. In Austria (with one exception) the nomination is in the Emperor.‡ In Hungary the Bishops are named by the Sovereign, and immediately exercise jurisdiction, as distinct from acts of spiritual order, before their confirmation. §

* Thomass. de Vet. et Nov. Eccles. Disc., P. ii. lib. ii. c. 1.

† Ibid., c. 33.

‡ Report from Select Committee on Regulation of Roman Catholic Subjects in Foreign Countries, p. 5.

§ Ibid. "In Hungary all bishops appointed by the sovereign immediately perform every part of their functions which relates to jurisdiction, before they have been confirmed by the Pope."

In Lombardy they are in like manner appointed by the Crown.* In the Venetian states they were chosen by the Senate.† In the kingdom of Naples, and much more in Sicily, the same privilege exists.‡ In Spain, Portugal, Germany,§ and even more signally in France, the nomination exists in the Supreme Civil power. It has been not untruly said by a French writer of great name in Ecclesiastical law, that "the instant the Church acquired a civil existence its dignities became real magistracies,‖" that they have "a delegated portion of the supreme" civil power united with their own spiritual office; and that on this ground the Sovereign, on behalf of his realm, not so much of himself as of his people, has a high interest in the selection of the persons to exercise this mixed civil and spiritual jurisdiction over them. For this reason the lay people through the civil power have, in the history of Christendom, at all times possessed a very extensive prerogative in recommending or nominating persons to the Episcopal office. I am not aware that in the late proceedings any doubt has been raised or any impatience expressed on this head. But here the power of Sovereigns is at an end. After the election or nomination, there has existed, in all ages and in every country I have cited, a distinct

* Report from Select Committee on Regulation of Roman Catholic Subjects in Foreign Countries, p. 13.

† Ibid., p. 14. ‡ Ibid., p. 18. § Ibid., pp. 28, 31, 40.

‖ Pithou, Ibid., p. 23.

judicial approval of the party elect, and that by the Spiritual power of the Church—in other words, a confirmation, or judicial examining of the formality of the election, and of the fitness of the person, both in faith and morals, according to the Canon law. In truth this power, or rather responsibility of confirming the election is to be traced with equal lineal clearness and certainty from the Apostles to this day. In the beginning they exercised it as a body in common. After their example, Bishops elect were examined and confirmed in the next ages by the Bishops of the whole Province. Numerous canons require the presence of the comprovincial Bishops even at the act of election.* Then for reasons of convenient order this collective confirmation was vested, in their behalf, in the Metropolitan.† He was their representative as well as chief: and the power of the Metropolitan was guarded by the Church in a series of Councils, as at Nice, Arles, Laodicea, Carthage, Chalcedon, and others, with a strictness so exact that a Bishop ordained without the consent of the Metropolitan was declared to be no Bishop.‡ The Seventh General Council ordains that the election of Bishops by Civil Magistrates, without the consent of the comprovincial Bishops and the confirmation of the Metropolitan, shall be

* Van Espen, Jur. Eccles., tom. i. tit. xiv. 1.
† Ibid., sect. 2.
‡ Dupin, De Antiq. Eccl. Discip. Diss. i. xii.

null and void: and orders such Bishops to be deposed and excommunicated.*

Let us now clearly define in what this act of confirmation consists. The first order on this head is by an inspired hand. St. Paul prescribes the qualifications to be required in a Bishop of the Church.† The Church in all ages has held itself bound by these injunctions, and has ordered a special examination to be made. I will not weary you by citing the series of canons which exist on this point. It is ordered in the Canon law that "diligent examination be made as to the process of election, and the person of the elect," that is to say, as to the regularity of the election, and as to the "knowledge, honesty of life, and age" of the elect; for a Metropolitan who confirms an unworthy person, or in an unlawful manner, is held to sin mortally. After the examination, and not before, when all qualifications have been found to concur, the act of confirmation is to be made.‡ This, it need not be said, was the

* Bevereg. Synodicon, tom. i. 288.

† 1 Tim. iii. 1-7; Titus i. 5-9.

‡ "Is autem ad quem confirmatio pertinet diligenter examinare debet, et electionis processum, et personam electi. Est enim hoc generale ut ad eum pertineat examinatio, ad quem manus impositio spectat. Et cum omnia rite concurrunt tunc munus ei confirmationis impendat. Quod si secus facta fuerit, non solum dejiciendus erit indigne promotus verum etiam indignè promovens puniendus."

The comment on this text runs—"Tenetur enim examinare personam electi, maxime in scientiâ, honestate vitæ, et ætate: quia

process observed in all ages of the Church. In the Church of England, in particular, we have evidence of its exercise, even in times when the Royal prerogative was not slack.* And the same forms of postulation and inquiry are preserved in the confirmation of Bishops elect down to this day. A petition is preferred by the Dean and Chapter, praying for confirmation, and setting forth nine Articles required to be proved by the Canon law, for the establishing of the election, of which the seventh is as follows: that the person elected "fuit et est vir providus et discretus, ac sacrarum literarum doctrinâ et scientiâ sufficienter imbutus, necnon vitâ et moribus merito commendatus," &c. Against the proof of these articles objectors are summoned, which is twice done before sentence is given.

These responsibilities, and therefore rights, of the Metropolitan continued in exercise for the first thousand or twelve hundred years of the Church.† During this time, while the confirmation of their suffragans belonged exclusively to them, the confirmation of election to the Metropolitical see was reserved, as a

si indignum confirmet, vel illegitime, peccat mortaliter."—Lancelot, Institutiones Juris Canonici, tit. ix.

* Constit. Othobon., A.D. 1268. De Confirmatione Episcoporum. "Pastoralis sedis eminentia multis indigens gratiæ Divinæ muneribus ut Pastor in se mundus ambulet coram Deo in meritum, et in conspectu populi ad doctrinam," &c.—Lyndwode, Provin., &c., p. 133.

† Thomass. P. ii. l. ii. xliii. 5, 6, 7.

matter of form, first to Primates, then to the see of Rome. After the year 1200 the act of confirming to suffragan Bishoprics also passed, with many other mixed offices, from the Metropolitan to the Roman See.* This was an arrangement of order or temporary policy. In like manner as the nomination or recommendation of the Bishop to be elected passed, as an arrangement of public convenience, from the people and clergy to the Sovereign, without so much as questioning the primary, and even inherent, though dormant, right of the original electors, so the office of confirming the election passed by a parallel usage from the Bishops of the Provinces to the Metropolitan, and from the Metropolitan to the Pope, always preserving unquestioned the inalienable original right of the provincial Episcopate. Indeed this principle was perpetually recognized and appealed to. Even in the ages when the Roman jurisdiction was in fullest external vigour throughout the Latin Church, the power of the Metropolitan to confirm was never denied or doubted. It was, as it has been called, the legitimate remedy of public disorder † between the Spiritual and Civil powers; the provision by which the Flock of Christ was preserved in their spiritual estate from the evils brought by wars, contests, and

* Van Espen, Jur. Eccl., tom. i. tit. xiv. 7–12.

† "Legitimum remedium in Scissurâ a majoribus nostris usurpari solitum." — De Thou, quoted by Pereira, Tentativa Theologica, translated by the Rev. E. H. Landon, p. 232.

disputes upon Christian Kingdoms. Of this we have numberless recorded examples in the history of Germany, Spain, France, England, and other states during the twelfth, fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries.

One celebrated Theologian says, "Upon the breaking out of war, there was an established rule in the Canon law, that where there is any danger, impediment, or delay in the recourse to Rome, the Bishops may provide in their respective Bishoprics for the proper Ecclesiastical Government and salvation of souls, even in those causes which are reserved of right to the Roman Pontiff, on account of imminent necessity."* This rule is founded by the Canonists upon the distinction between what belongs to the perfect extrinsic order, and what is necessary to the salvation of souls, and inherent in the Episcopate of the Church. Let us take the examples of this rule during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, when for many years France, Spain, England, Germany, and other countries initiated and concluded all Spiritual and Ecclesiastical acts and causes within their own limits. For instance, in the year 1398, in the reign of Charles VII., the Prelates and Doctors of France assembled at Paris to treat of the measures proper to be adopted during the great schism, which had then endured for twenty years:

* Melchior Canus, quoted by Pereira, Tentativa Theologica, p. 243.

"twelve Archbishops, sixty Bishops, seventy Abbots, the Rectors, Theologians, and Canonists of the Universities of Paris, Toulouse, Orleans, and Angers were present. Out of 300 votes 247 were in favour of withdrawing obedience from both the contending Popes, Benedict and Boniface; and determined that their Bishops of the kingdom should provide spiritually, in all cases of necessity, for collation to benefices, election, and the like."* The kingdoms of England, Sicily, Jerusalem, Castille, Navarre, the Duke of Bavaria, the republic of Genoa, the estates of Flanders, followed the same course. Again, in the year 1408, the Church of France made the same decree. In pursuance of this rule Philip, Archbishop of Lyons, in 1408, confirmed the election of Louis, Archbishop of Rouen, dispensing at the same time with the Canons respecting the age of the Archbishop Elect.† The same course was followed by the Church of Spain in 1398. In 1415, that is, during the reign of Henry V., the same course was pursued. In the Rolls of Parliament we find a statute directing the Metropolitan to resume his dormant functions:—

"Our Lord the King having regard to the long voidance of the Apostolic See, through the damnable schism which has long, and still endures in Holy Church, and it is not known how long it will still

* Melchior Canus, quoted by Pereira, Tentativa Theologica, p. 229.

† Le Quien, Gallia Christiana, tom. iv. p. 173.

endure; and seeing that certain Cathedral Churches within his realm, which are of the foundation of his noble progenitors, and are of his patronage, have been and are still destitute of pastoral government, because that the persons chosen to them cannot obtain confirmation through default of the Apostolic office" (the Pontiff), "to the great peril of souls, damage and destruction of the possessions of the said churches;" "and considering also that divers confirmations have been and are made in places beyond sea by the Metropolitans;" it is ordered that all persons "elected within his realms during the voidance of the said Apostolic See, shall be confirmed by the Metropolitan of the place;" and the Metropolitans are thereby charged without delay to proceed to confirm. There were present the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishops of London and Durham. The mandates founded upon this statute still exist; and we find in A.D. 1416, John Wakeryng, Archdeacon of Canterbury, elected as Bishop of Norwich, and confirmed by the Metropolitan.*

In like manner again, in the year 1527, the kingdoms of England and France concurred in a decree made at Amiens, by which it was declared that, during the wars then carrying on in Italy, whatsoever

* Rolls of Parliament, iv. p. 71, and Rymer's Fœdera, vol. iv. p. 556. For this precedent I am indebted to Mr. Badeley, to whom it is a duty to tender also our thanks for his noble argument in the Court of Queen's Bench.

should be determined by the Prelates and Clergy of the kingdoms of England and France respectively concerning the administration of Ecclesiastical affairs, should in all things be held valid and firm.*

The principle on which this decree was founded is plainly as follows:—That by the divine institution of our Lord, the Spiritualty of the Church in France and in England respectively was full and sufficient to initiate and perfect all acts of order and jurisdiction, so far as their validity for the salvation of souls. No challenge of this principle was ever ventured.

The convention of Amiens, between France and England, was subsequently dissolved. In France it was not formally renewed, but in England, five years later, what had been before only a transient condition, was again renewed and became provisionally permanent—I mean by the well-known statute of the 24th of Henry VIII. That statute in its very terms is founded upon principles familiar in the States of Europe for two centuries; the only difference being that former examples were transient because the necessities which created them were transient: this has been permanent because its cause has been more lasting.

The terms of that statute run:—"Where by divers sundry and authentic histories and chronicles it is manifestly declared and expressed, that this realm of England is an *Empire*, and so hath been accepted

* Mémoires du Clergé de France, tom. x. p. 556.

in the world, governed by one supreme head and king, having dignity and royal estate of the Imperial Crown of the same, unto whom a body politic, compact of all sorts and degrees of people, divided in terms and by names of spiritualty and temporalty, been bounden, and owen to bear next to God a natural and humble obedience; he being also institute and furnished by the goodness and sufferance of almighty God with plenary, whole, and entire power, pre-eminence, authority, prerogative, and jurisdiction to render and yield justice and final determination to all manner of folk, resiants, or subjects within this his realm, in all causes, matters, debates, and contentions happening to occur, insurge, or begin within the limits thereof, without restraint or provocation to any *foreign* prince or potentate of the world. The Body Spiritual whereof having power when any cause of the Divine law happened to come in question, or of spiritual learning, that it was declared, interpreted, and shewed by that part of the said body politic called the Spiritualty, now being usually (i. e. in 1532) called the English Church, which always hath been reputed, and also found of that sort, that both for knowledge, integrity, and sufficiency of number, it hath been always thought, and is also at this time sufficient and meet of itself without the intermeddling of any *exterior* person or persons to declare and determine all such doubts, and to administer all such offices or duties as to their rooms

spiritual doth appertain." Then follows a like declaration of the sufficiency of the Temporalty for temporal jurisdiction; and the clause ends with—"and both these authorities and jurisdictions do conjoin together in the due administration of justice, the one to help the other."* The principles on which this statute is founded are these two: namely, first, that the Realm of England is not a fief or feudal state depending on any foreign temporal lord, but an Empire full and sufficient in itself: and secondly, that the Church of England is by Divine institution full and sufficient for the exercise of all spiritual acts and jurisdiction within its own limits. No supremacy is claimed for the Crown over the Spiritualty, but a *Civil* Supremacy—a supremacy of *Temporal* power in *temporal* things, and in the *temporal accident* of Spiritual things. The Spiritual power and jurisdiction is declared to be perfect in itself, according to the rule laid down in all the decrees already cited of the Churches and kingdoms of France, Spain, Germany, and the like.

On these principles and on this statute was founded, in the following year, A. D. 1533, the act entitled "An Act for electing and consecrating of Archbishops and Bishops within this Realm.†" After reciting the 23rd of Henry VIII., which enacted, that

* 24 Henry VIII., c. 12, 1.

† 25 Henry VIII., c. 20. See Gibson's Codex, vol. i., pp. 105, 107.

if any person "presented to the See of Rome to be Bishop of any see or diocese within this realm, should happen to be letted, delayed, or deferred at the See of Rome . . . . . that then every person so presented *might* or *should* be consecrated in England by the Archbishop in whose province the said Bishopric shall be:" the statute then goes on to enact further, that "no person or persons hereafter shall be presented and nominated, or commended" to the See of Rome for any Bishopric. The sequel prescribes the manner of electing by the chapter, and of confirming and consecrating the Bishop elect by the Metropolitan.

Who does not see, therefore, that the instant and direct effect of this act is to affirm, uphold, and protect the office of the Metropolitan; to reinvest it with the functions which—vitally and inalienably inherent in him with the Bishops of his province—had, during the later ages of Ecclesiastical usage, passed from him to an authority beyond the limit of the realm? It directs him, "with all speed and celerity," to use his own powers, without waiting the licence of any other. These statutes do not more broadly declare the temporal sovereignty of the Crown than the spiritual independence of the Church. Moreover, the first statute, which is the basis of all, is not an enacting but a declaratory law. It opens with a recital of "histories and chronicles:" it lays its whole foundation upon the common law of the realm, the unwritten

rights of the Temporalty and Spiritualty of England. The supremacy of the Crown here claimed is the supremacy founded in the common law; and such is the interpretation given to it within the last two years most soundly and incontrovertibly, by the highest legal authorities in the highest court of law in this realm. It therefore restores to the Archbishop of Canterbury the same power as that which we have seen actually exercised by the Archbishop of Lyons in confirming the election to the see of Rouen, and by the Archbishop of Canterbury, in A.D. 1416, in confirming the Bishop of Norwich. The intention of the statute is to exclude a *foreign claim*, not to extinguish an *internal jurisdiction*; it specially cites and preserves the conjoint jurisdictions which, through the course of histories and chronicles, may be traced concurrent side by side. It created, therefore, no new principle; it set up no new claim; it enacted no new law, much less did it violate the laws and canons of the Church of God, as they obtained by immemorial use within the realm of England. It changed nothing either in the spiritualty or temporalty respectively, or in their relations the one to the other.

Let us now look, for a moment, at a part of the late proceedings and their practical effect.

It was argued erroneously, as I believe almost all men already see, that the civil power of this realm is invested with the prerogative of making a final and absolute choice of the person to be elected

and consecrated; that the act of confirmation is not judicial, but only ministerial; that no tribunal exists to judge of the fitness or unfitness of the party; that the only course for an upright metropolitan to pursue, when called on to consecrate an unfit person to the office of Bishop, is to obey the act of Parliament, or to resign.

On these assertions I would observe, first, that this claim robs the people of the Church of a very high and sacred power.

We have already seen that the sovereign, in recommending persons for the pastoral office, is in a sense the representative of the laity. He is the standing witness of their deep interest in the character and worthiness of those who shall be their guides in the way of eternal life. So momentous is this interest, that the people have still reserved to them a very important and effective share in these elections. No man can be ordained even to the order of deacon, until notice shall have been publicly given in the face of the church during divine service, with invitation to any person knowing impediment to declare the same to the bishop. The same course is again solemnly observed before advancing to the order of the priesthood. This is intended for the security of the people against the admission of unfit men among their spiritual pastors. In like manner, but with still greater solemnity, because of the far greater importance, and power for evil and for good,

of the episcopal office, this process is repeated in the election of any man for the order of bishops. In fact, the electing power is distributed into two parts: the crown possesses the power to choose out and recommend; the people, including the clergy, possess the power of hindering by active objection, or of sharing by tacit consent in the election of their bishop. We cannot but regard this as a question of great moment; and we must look upon it not as a clerical question but, as most emphatically it is, a popular question. The clergy indeed have a further guarantee against the consecration of unfit persons in the Bishops who are of their own order. But the laity, that is, the people at large, have no voice except at the time, and in the Court held by the Metropolitan for the confirmation of the Bishop elect. It is specially their Christian privilege which is struck at in the denial of the judicial character of the confirmation; and it is above all their interest, and their duty as fathers and trustees for posterity, to vindicate at once and for ever this great power and safeguard. Moreover, at this moment when our institutions are adjusting themselves to an age quick with popular sympathies, it is a retrograde movement most discordant with all public justice. It is for us clearly to show how the Church is ordained for the good of the people at large, and how all the powers and functions of the pastoral office, even to the highest, are pledges of the Christian liberty of our lay breth-

ren. This topic is almost inexhaustible, but we must pass on.

I will not trespass on your attention by dwelling at length on another consequence of this claim in its bearing upon the spiritual responsibility of the whole Episcopate. It is self-evident that, in judging of the fitness of the Bishop elect, the Metropolitan acts in behalf of all his suffragans, taking security for the faith and discipline of the Church. This is their special trust, of which they will have to give special account. The Divine Head of the Church founded it not in books or in abstractions, but in living foundations, that is, in men, in the company of the Apostles.* The very existence of the Church depends upon the living succession of faithful men, that is, of pastors and people. The ordaining of fit men is the life of the spiritual body; its vitality could not be more directly aimed at than in the point of fitness for the apostolic office. It is not more necessary that the Church should be the ultimate judge as to truth of doctrine than that it should be the ultimate judge as to the fitness of those whom it ordains to preach that doctrine.† To invest any other authority than the Church with the absolute selection of the persons of its pastors would be as extravagant as to invest the State with the ultimate decisions of faith. In one word, the civil

* Ephes. ii. 20; and iv. 11-15.

† 2 Tim. ii. 2.

power can no more judge without review of the fitness of a man for the Episcopate than it can frame doctrinal definitions. But this is a mere waste of words. Let us pass to one more remark.

The claim which has been thus set up, not by the Crown, but by certain advisers of the Crown who are but for a day, is a violation of the whole system of religious liberty, a breach of the entire order of Christian toleration. To compel a Metropolitan to consecrate a person judged by him to be unworthy, that is to lay hands suddenly in defiance of God's word and law, would in the constraining authority be persecution, and in the consecrator sacrilege. I must disbelieve that the laws of the realm of England can by any torture make persecution lawful, or sacrilege a duty.

But the report runs that it was further said—surely, in the inadvertence and pressure of an exciting moment—that in such a case an upright primate, rather than consecrate an unfit person, would resign his office. Let us take a case of undeniable unfitness—unfitness admitted on both sides of this argument—what if the whole lineal succession of primates should be found "upright?" The case refutes itself by proving that the final and absolute power is in those who alone can consecrate; that they may by resignation refuse in lineal succession for ever, which is, in fact, *a refusal to confirm the election.*

But, suppose the reverse. On the resignation of

one or any number of "upright" primates there shall at length one be found who will obey the act of Parliament, that is to say a primate who is not "upright," one willing to commit simony in accepting the primacy on the condition of obeying this supposed act of Parliament, and sacrilege in consecrating a man notoriously unworthy. Surely the noble and learned Lord who is reputed so to have argued, distinguished in his long career for a fearless uprightness himself, would be among the first to shrink from consequences so immoral. His jealousy for the purity of our august tribunals and for the sacredness of moral right on which the laws of England calmly and steadfastly repose would make him one of the foremost to redress so grave and burning a wrong, and to wipe off a shame so black and broad from the fair page of British jurisprudence. Nay, but in all this argument one Person has been forgotten, one Prince, one only Potentate, "on whose head are many crowns." Let it but once appear that acts of human legislation clash with the obedience which He claims, with the loyalty which is purchased by His Cross, and statutes vanish as threads in a furnace. In such a case we will be bold to say not only a Primate of His Church must not obey the act of Parliament, but that he was consecrated to withstand it; that the end of his being as of his office is to witness and to suffer for the supremacy of a Master in Heaven.

But God be thanked this is not now the case. It

is to be lamented that the word Prerogative should have been so freely used in this affair. There never was the least disposition to deny or to resist any prerogative of our Princes. They who resisted a late misuse of the name, and a late misinterpretation of the power, would of all men desire to see our Sovereign invested with all the fair Christian prerogatives which were ever wielded by her Saxon and Sainted ancestry. This was never in debate. The question was as to the nature of the Prerogative itself, which all alike revered. If the question had been fairly stated, it surely would have answered itself. All were agreed as to the privilege of the Crown to recommend fit persons to the Episcopate. Who ever claimed the prerogative of selecting unfit persons? Who ever contended that the perfection of that privilege consists in the power to nominate unworthy men for the office of a Bishop in the Church of God? It would be like saying that the perfection of free existence is the power of committing suicide: or that the perfection of a moral agent is to perpetrate immoralities. And yet this is, indeed, the principle involved in the argument.

But suppose it to be said that the Crown, being final and absolute in its acts, could not submit its choice to the judicial review of the Metropolitan without losing its final and absolute character.

Surely no one will use such language in this realm—if any one, not at least a high legal autho-

rity. This is not the spirit of our English jurisprudence. This is not the genius of our mature and majestic Law. If there be any thing well defined in its character, circumscribed in rightful limitation, though absolute within its sphere, it is the Prerogative of our Princes. The power of the Crown is shorn of none of its majesty by recognising the supremacy of law. The length of its sway is not shortened by describing the well-known outlines of written and unwritten right. If this be no diminution of its majesty in the state of this world, much less within the range of the spiritual order. To what must it there needs vail its greatness but to the laws of God—that is, of Him to whom every creature in Heaven and Earth is subject? The Crown could have no prerogative in choosing Pastors, if the Church in His Name had not bestowed it. And it bestowed this privilege as it bestows all its gifts and benedictions, upon conditions of moral right. The humblest Christian has a right, by virtue of his Baptism, to the Sacraments of the Church; but not in a state of unworthiness. There is a judge of his fitness—the same who gave him Baptism—and that judge not only does not limit, much less destroy his right, but upholds and perfects it, in restraining him by the laws of moral fitness. So of all powers founded in the Church of Christ. They are subject to conditions, imposed by Himself when He created them. When they violate His conditions they annul themselves.

To sum up the case: let us remember that no law or canon of the Church has in this event been abrogated: no new statute made—nothing of our existing order has been changed: but an ancient law has been *misinterpreted* and *misapplied*. And this also has arisen through no constraint of the Civil Power; by no coercion of the State. It was an error committed by the Spiritual Power itself: that is by the Metropolitan sitting in his Court. The only part hitherto borne by the Civil Power in this affair was to refuse to interfere: that is, to refuse to compel the Metropolitan to revoke his acts. The State, therefore, has hitherto been simply passive. And we may treat the act of the Metropolitan, or rather of his Commissary, as a transient error. "*Non dicitur factum quod non perseverat.*" It is as yet remediable, and that easily; for there is needed no act of Legislature to enact or even to declare: no mandamus or intervention of any Civil Court. All that is required is a true exposition of the law, and a regular application of its principles, at the next instance, by the Spiritual Judge, sitting in his own Court.

We may confidently hope that this event will have provoked and insured a thorough investigation of laws, uncertain,—not in themselves, for what can be more clear?—but to functionaries who have never before been called on to apply them: and that this investigation will lead to a fair acknowledgment and candid recognition of the high responsibilities attaching to

the spiritualty and temporalty in the concurrent exercise of their functions.

Here then we may leave this question, looking for its final and recorded correction, and believing that as on the one side there was absolutely no thought of resisting any prerogative of the Crown, so on the other there was no intention of infringing the discipline of the Church of Christ.

And now let us pass from the limits of any present event to thoughts which the aspect of civilized and Christian nations must force upon us. Surely the last year has uttered its warnings to men of good will. What state, what kingdom of Europe has not been shaken? "The foundations of the round world have been discovered;" and can we believe this all but universal shaking to be the work of man? Must we not go on and say with the Psalmist, "At thy chiding, O Lord, at the blasting of the breath of thy displeasure?"* When we look abroad at Monarchies overthrown in a night; Empires falling asunder as a heap of dust; civil polities shifting like the scenes of a drama; Kings in peril and in exile; nations maddened against themselves; fathers and brothers, to the cry of Fraternity, steeping their own hearths in blood; every form of confusion astir and abroad, hurrying before them the wisdom and the toil of ages—when these things come to pass under our very eyes, can we doubt Who it is that is remov-

* Ps. xviii. 15.

ing the "things that are shaken," "that those things which cannot be shaken may remain?"* When we see, as it were, the whole order of human society, the framework of old Christendom, the lofty civilization of a thousand years, with its thrones and legislatures, tribunals and traditions, heaving up and ready to melt away, can we fail to turn with our whole heart and with our whole soul, to stay ourselves on that one "kingdom which cannot be moved" —the Church of God and of His Christ? This surely is the lesson He is teaching us. Is not the whole history of the world related to the trial of the Church? All that ever passed since the Word was made Flesh has been for its perfection: the whole providence of God, in all its procedure, has formed and fashioned the course of this world for the unfolding of the mystery of Christ's Body upon earth. For this cause the world persecuted it in the beginning; espoused it in the middle age of Christendom; is divorcing it now. These seem clearly to be three marked periods of its destiny on earth. In the first it was isolated, united, suffering. Our Lord would not accept the homage of the world till He had conquered it by Martyrs. When the world could do no more against Him, He received it not as a patron, but as a penitent.

In the second period, dating from the conversion of the Empire, the civil powers of the world entered

* Heb. xii. 27.

into peace with the Church: and the Church accepted their gifts without fear. The incorporation of the Church with Christian states is a great event—a work of the Divine Providence: full of blessings to mankind. The labour then was to sanctify not persons only, but nations; not households, but races: it gathered up into the kingdom of God not only the force and will of individuals, but dynasties and powers. The conservation and guidance of the monarchies of the earth was the mission of the medieval Church. Christianity was the basis of all civilization, of all social order, of all jurisprudence, of all internal policy, of all international justice.

It may be that, in the later ages of this second period, the spiritual power suffered from its contact with the world: that it savoured of the earth, and, in its exercise, became, so far as a Divine order could be, earthly. No wonder princes claimed to give the ring and the crosier, when Bishops levied war on each other's flocks. It cannot be denied that the Ecclesiastical body was corrupted and the secular debased. If the spiritual weighed heavy where it had no Divine commission to lay a finger, the secular was avenged by inflicting manifold corruptions. But those ages and those periods are past: there is no danger now of the spiritual power encroaching on the civil. Even if any would attempt it, there is a stream in the collective will of mankind which bears irresistibly another way. The whole civilization and

secular state of the world, as in the first times it set towards the Church, so it now sets from it. The second age is fast passing away, if these last changes do not force us to say, already past. The religious unity of Christendom is broken, not outwardly alone, but inwardly, even in those countries where it seems still united. The unbelief of the last times has set in, and the great deep of infidelity stands open. To dream now of spiritual encroachments is wandering of mind—a blindness to the facts of noon-day which shine around us. It betrays an incapacity of estimating and of fronting the real perils which are now in our path. Throughout Europe the medieval state is already broken up. It exists in theories and books, but as a living and active system it is no more. The whole Ecclesiastical Status, the mixed spiritual and civil jurisdiction of the Church is either powerless or extinct: its endowments have been secularized, its whole basis shifted from the traditions of centuries and the prescriptions of the Empire to concordats and compacts, modern charters and constitutions of yesterday. A little while ago England stood in a prominence of ill fame, for suppression of monasteries, spoliations of the Church, and the like. At this day we are left behind as timid and tardy by the bolder career of France and Spain. The anti-ecclesiastical tendency is universal. Individuals may be still devoted and loyal to the idea of a supernatural kingdom; but the masses are moving if not

against it, at least in a perpetual departure from the unity of ancient Christendom.

There is also another feature of these times to be observed. The popular impulse or principle, call it as you will, whether it be democratic, republican, or tempered as with us, is likewise universal. In these latter times there is no peril that the Church should gain too much power, or that people should have too much belief; but the direct reverse. Great dangers there are to the Church not only in our own land, but throughout the whole world: and those dangers may be summed up in two points—the one a tendency to merge the spiritual in the civil power, the other to set them in opposition.

The tendency to merge the Spiritual power in the Civil, the Church in the State, is no new danger. It began as soon as the Civil powers of the world assumed to exercise authority within the kingdom of Christ. The power which princes have for the truth, is easily turned against it. And when secular accidents intermingle in spiritual questions, a third kind of matter arises—a mixed subject which is termed Ecclesiastical—the debateable frontier, and in times of conflict, the debated ground between the two jurisdictions. And here the civil power has always had great advantages, from the fact that in such questions the outward form of the dispute is secular and matter of sight, whereas the principle, being spiritual, is inward and an object of faith. The world,

therefore, is united in declaring by untold majorities, and by the judgment of its own tribunals, that the whole subject of debate is of civil jurisdiction. And in such contests might for the most part has the upper hand of right. Power always seems to be on the side of order. They who hold by faith to the laws of the spiritual kingdom seem to be fanatical, and troublers of Israel. And so the world is on the winning side—that is, for a while; for in the long run, right overpowers might. The prerogatives of Christ's kingdom, as they are eternal so they are invincible, and in the end stand fast for ever. Nevertheless, tracing down the history of Christendom we shall see that the civil powers have ever attempted to set up and often succeeded in establishing their claims. For proof of this let any one read the later councils of the Greek Church, and the comments of its canonists extolling the supremacy of the Byzantine Emperors. Or again, let any one trace the history of the Church in Western Europe. There is not a kingdom in which the same tendency is not to be seen. It is but the natural bent of the fallen world exalting itself against an unseen Lord. "We will not have this man to reign over us."

Even in ages when the spiritual power most loudly asserted its independence, the civil powers were most aggressive or threatening. For in truth what was it that wrung out the bold and fearless assertion of a divine mission but the pretensions of temporal lords?

As early heresies, by their logical oppositions, called out into definite and peremptory decrees the original doctrine of the faith, so the claims of the civil power demanded the direct assertion of spiritual right and freedom. And the very times which have been thought to be ages of ecclesiastical ambition were to the Church seasons of imminent and special danger through the designs and assaults of civil rulers. On the whole review of Church history it is clear that national and local sovereignties have to a great extent succeeded in establishing their pretensions. The sword has ever been stronger than the crosier, and the sceptre weightier than the pastoral staff. The ecclesiastical prerogatives of Christian princes, interpreted by their own courts and advisers, have in every age gone beyond the limit of original right. The ancient codes, now perishing from continental Europe, as in Austria, France, Sicily, and the like, contain royal claims and privileges which it would be hard to reconcile with the just freedom of the Church.

These written encroachments in spiritual things are, indeed, passing away; not so the living tendency to supreme control. Many causes have concurred in the last three hundred years to give to the temporal power an advantage over the spiritual. The great schism of the West, brought on chiefly by secularity in the ecclesiastical body, destroying for a century the union of the Church, weakened the

principle of unity, and the spiritual idea of the Church itself in the consciences of men. The just demand for reforms running through the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries, too long delayed, brought in confusion. The Church in all lands was weakened. Its order was overthrown; its divine offices resisted. The denial of its spiritual commission and power became not only a theory, but a doctrine; religious bodies founded themselves on the principle of separation; the whole Church, as an object of faith, became fainter, and its hold upon the conscience feeble. And in the hour of its true weakness the name of the Church was used to break the bonds of civil obedience, and to sow rebellion between people and their princes. What wonder if civil powers seized the fatal moment for establishing their sway? That which the Church hardly resisted while it was strong, it then and since has failed to defeat. For the last three hundred years the enlargement of civil supremacy has been perpetually and everywhere advancing. Take, for example, the whole history of the Gallican liberties, in other words, of the prerogatives of the crown of France, or the later concordats with the Republic and the Empire, or the ecclesiastical policy of Austria under and since Joseph II.; or again Northern and Central Germany, or, above all, take the spoliation and state of the Church in Spain. It may be said, therefore, with truth that in all the older countries of Europe

the state is absorbing all it can of ecclesiastical power: but in so doing it is disengaging the spiritual elements of the Church, repelling them from itself, forcing them towards each other, combining them by their kindred laws of mutual sympathy and support. Even in countries in which the ecclesiastical authority is sovereign, the same process is going on. The civil state is organizing itself on a secular basis, and assuming the character and functions of other kingdoms. The possessions, privileges, and coercive jurisdiction of the Church are manifestly passing everywhere into the control of the civil state. But even more than this: in a large part of Germany, with which England has great affinity both by ancestry and by language, it is formally avowed as a scientific theory, or I might say as a theological axiom, that the Church of Christ is in every place the religious life of nations expressing itself through an organization of its own; in other words, that nations frame their own Church as they frame their own constitution. Again, we are told that society Christianized is the Church; or in other words, that the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ is not a kingdom founded by Him, a polity spiritual and separate from all human polities, but a property, or a disembodied quality, which may or may not inhere in a civil society. We hear, too, of Churches yet to come, of future organizations of the spiritual life of people, upheld by a higher unity than "the Church throughout all the

world." I speak of this only because each and all of these ingenious flights first deny the divine character and office of the one visible Church; next, deal with it as a malleable and ductile element to be fashioned by the will of nations; and therefore, at last, treat it as a subject matter of social compacts and civil legislation, which is, in fact, finally to absorb the Church into the State by denying its separate existence.

Such are the civil and intellectual tendencies of these later times. And we have not escaped their force. In the last eighteen years we have not indeed an enunciation of any such theory, but many facts which such theories would alone justify: as, for instance, the continued suspension of provincial synods; the erection of civil commissions with ecclesiastical names and functions; the initiation of ecclesiastical measures in Parliament, the sense of the Church not being first taken upon them; the suppression and union of Sees, changes of jurisdiction, and of canonical obedience, attempts to secularise or obtain control of the education of the people, projects respecting rules and judgments of heresy, and other events, such as we have already considered at large. Now I do not believe that these things have been done with any conscious intention of disturbing the relations of the spiritual and civil powers in this realm. They who did them, or consented in them, were in many cases our own guides and rulers. The movement of the age was too strong for them.

The other danger is an evident tendency, in the minds of some at least, to set the Church and State in opposition. This is an inevitable reaction from the contrary tendency: and they are answerable who have challenged it by civil encroachment. The history not more of the Church than of mankind proves that encroachments generate reprisals. Let us leave to speak of foreign lands. If a hostile feeling, and an open opposition between the spiritual and civil powers, for the chastisement of our many sins, which God avert, befall this land, it may be said with all truth that on our part there has been no aggression.

If ever there was a time when the Church of England has laboured hard within its own sphere, molesting no one, intent on its own high commission both at home and abroad, it is in these twenty years last past, since the change of our civil polity cast it for support upon its own spiritual origin and centre. If collisions come, we will be not the aggressor. If the heavy disaster of opposition between the two great powers of order by which this realm is upheld should ever fall upon us, alas for him who shall make it the duty of the Church to obey God rather than man. "The beginning of strife is as when one letteth out water:" and the flood which will burst forth on the first breach of old and sacred relations, no man can foresee. Only He that measureth the sea in the hollow of His hand can know the depth of such a desolation. We have a slight

shadow of it in our seventeenth century with a population of a few millions, feeble as yet in the impulses of popular licence. We have the living witness of other lands to warn us of the depths which an hour may break up. Fifty years ago the statesmen and princes of the French monarchy little thought what a deluge of the nethermost hell they were about to loose—with what sacrilege their country would be blighted—with what perpetual instability their civil state would be smitten. Little did they foresee that the richest and maturest fruits of Christian civilization would be swept before the torrent of infidelity, and that the annals of their proud dynasty would become a calendar of revolutions. Who then foresaw that the empire of Charlemagne, the throne of thirty kings, the glory of a thousand years, the royal state at whose Augustan splendour the world wondered—that France, the fountain of laws and civilization, the leader of conquests, the home of science, philosophy, and the culture of mankind, should become the crater of Europe, the issue of corruption, confusion, and perennial strife, or that the stately Church of Gaul with its discipline and councils, its lineage of Saints and Doctors, should give way before the mockeries of reason, the impurities of communism, the Antichrist of spurious fraternity? All these ancient institutions, firm "as the bars of the earth," have been once and again clean swept away before the flood of anarchy, the first-born of domestic

strife. And what greater securities have we to hold by? What is there in our civil and social state to exempt us from the destiny of empires when they begin "even to fight against God?" Let this be a timely warning to those who guide our councils.

It is almost universally seen that opposition to definite acts of unjust power ends in opposition to the power itself. To resist acts of the civil authority may be a duty, to resist the civil authority as such is the sin of rebellion. The state is a creation of God, next after the Church, the highest in the world. Within its own circle it is supreme. In all things of this world it has no superior but God alone. Tertullian could say "*Colimus . imperatorem . solo Deo minorem.*" It is a part of revealed morality to obey. It is our duty, without subservience or adulation, to honour any whom God sets in authority. The Church is bound by the command and the example of her Lord to render a ready, full, free obedience to the civil ruler. There is, out of the range of spiritual sins, no more deadly note against a Christian, or any portion of the Church, than rebellion: where this is, nothing can be sound. The whole spiritual life is tainted at the spring. Obedience, though manifold in its forms, is in its principle one and simple.

Believing then that both the Church and the State have their being and authority from God, and that the concord between them was an intent of the Divine will, a subject of prophecy, a fulfilment of

His providence, and an act of His Government over the world, it follows that to set them in opposition is to undo a Divine work; to mar one of His mercies towards mankind; and to contradict the will of Him who wedded them together. Whosoever shall hasten, by one day, an event so pregnant with evil, makes himself responsible for the blood of souls. For let us bear in mind that what we call the union of Church and State is, in effect and fruit, the Christianity of nations. The first act of union was the baptism of the Empire: and from that day the Church took up and cherished the collective traditionary life of kingdoms.

Upon this the whole of our public religion rests: all the customs, usages, instincts of our people are Christian by inheritance. The order of the Church is their birthright. The whole land is sown thick with memorials and means of salvation: churches, altars, pastors, sacraments of grace, perpetual instruction, spiritual oversight,—these are the heirloom of our people, and of their children yet unborn. Who will venture to cut off this entail? Who will dare to rob them of their right?—to devour the trust we have received for them from God? This Christian and social state is the fruit of the union of the spiritual and civil powers in long ages past. To break up its mere passive completeness, to destroy its universality, to efface the spiritual and pastoral limits of dioceses and parishes, which contain our

whole population—with all the relations and duties of charity and care founded upon them—what would it be but to rob millions of worship, doctrine, baptism—and so far as the civil power can, to disinherit them of the hope of life? And yet this is the inevitable consequence of a hostile opposition of the Church and the State. Let us, on our part, endure anything which can be endured for Christ's sake rather than hasten by one hour this day of calamity. Let us, at least, be guiltless; and on the other side, let politicians look well to their plans and schemes. If there be one way more certain than another to bring down this portentous evil, to lay waste the fair order of Christian life which, from the ages of our Saxon forefathers, has descended to this day, and to unite the whole spiritual power of the Church in this land in one inflexible opposition to civil decrees, it will be an attempt to usurp upon the office and the freedom of the Church, which in our baptismal creed is an article of faith, and in our conscience is a law of life. Is it a wonder if men ardent and zealous for the Master whom they serve, should desire even at once to break the bonds which bind them to so great a peril? Nay, the course of the last few years has brought many, even of the most calm and balanced judgment, to discuss whether this or that be not a question of principle and a point of conscience. Many, who hold sacred our ancient relations, are already resolved to contract no new engagements with a body

so changeful as a political Government. Let statesmen weigh well the danger of generating such convictions in minds that are the most temperate—the certain calamity of awakening a conscientious opposition in those to whom this world is nothing and Christ's kingdom everything.

But there need be no danger of this unhappy collision, if the ancient limits and the long-matured alliance of the two jurisdictions, spiritual and temporal, as recorded in our common and statute law, be preserved inviolate. We desire no new civil prerogatives: but let the State lay no hand upon our old and sacred liberties. We desire nothing but the freedom Christ has given to His Church. More we do not ask; less we dare not accept.

And this leads on to a few words more personal to ourselves: I mean as to the manner in which we shall bear ourselves at such a season.

Our first duty seems to be a firm and watchful resistance of any change in the truths and laws on which the Church is founded. The Church of England lives by lineal and unbroken continuity with its past; it knows no founders but the Apostles; no doctrine but the Catholic Faith; no heresy but what the Church condemns; no spiritual government but the one Episcopate; no authority over the religious conscience but spiritual decrees. With these no man may tamper. On these no power of this world may venture a touch. Necessity is laid upon us, and we

cannot escape. We are the guardians of this sacred trust: and for it we shall be held to answer. Let us not, for any allurements of efficiency from legislatures, or of aid from treasuries, yield one hair-breadth of the laws which are the charter of life. If we think to serve the Church by the least concession of its divine liberties, we shall but destroy it utterly. The principles of a spiritual body are its vitality. A body that has abandoned these is not worth preserving. "If the salt have lost its savour, wherewith shall it be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men."

Let us then, in the fear of God, and with firmness of will, turn away from all invitations which may entangle us in the instability of the civil state. Our safety is in keeping within the precincts of that One Body in which is One Faith, and One Baptism: the witness of God against the multiplicity of error, and the confusion of the world.

Our next duty at all times, but chiefly at such a time as this, is a plain positive affirmation of the faith and laws of Christ. The aim of the Apostles was not controversy, but to "make disciples of all nations." They preached, not argued: they wielded truths not negations. They had learned of their Divine Lord, Who, to cast out falsehood from the earth, came Himself—the Truth—and dwelt among us: and where truth is, falsehood cannot be. And this

gives us the law of our labour. It is not to deal with negatives and refutations, but with life-giving, substantial verities. Destructive theology is necessary, like warfare; but the end of man is peace. The true life of man is in tranquil and fruitful labour, in the gathering and use of God's good gifts. So in revelation, the true theology is affirmative and constructive; not to destroy, but to fulfil; to conserve what exists, to add what is wanting—building up, fulfilling, perfecting the body of Christ by the substance of living truth. And in the midst of a controversial age let this be our aim and toil. While others debate, let us build: while others spend time and strength in contradictions, let us firmly and peacefully teach, leaving to conscience and to God the issue of our work. Far be it from us to seek unity by vague generalization of doctrine; far also from us the self-deceit, that men do not differ in essential truths, and oppose each other with irreconcilable contradictions. That, alas! is too certain. Nevertheless there are great truths on which many who differ in matters of opinion are deeply agreed. For instance,—communities most opposed to us agree with us in this:—First, that the only hope of our salvation is in the ever-blessed Trinity, through the Incarnate Word, by very and true union and incorporation with Him. Next, that this union and incorporation is wrought in us, on God's part, by the gift of His sovereign grace, and on ours through a

living faith. And lastly, that our Lord Jesus Christ has ordained certain means through which this grace is given, and this faith is exercised.

In the two first points there is no diversity. It is only in the last; and there not in principle, but in detail. We believe those means to be His Church and Sacraments, the mystical body, and the joints and bands whereby it is united and nourished.

May we not believe that, if in the two first we had been more positive and fervent witnesses, fewer would have stumbled at the last? Is it any wonder that men should recoil from the teaching of means when the end is faintly propounded? The very grace of regeneration which is in us—the consciousness of living spiritual realities in the kingdom of the Son of God—rises up against a tone which lowers the Church of Christ to the ceremonial of the Mosaic law. Such is the view sometimes taken of the Church by earnest men among our separated brethren. It is our duty to undo this wrong. Happily the last ten years have helped to correct it. The positive assertions of spiritual origin and independence, forced from us by political events, have shown to many among them that we own no civil descent, and render to civil rulers none but a civil obedience. But this will not suffice. Let us all the more clearly bear our witness to the great mysteries of the person and work of our Divine Redeemer, as the foundation, centre, and life of all. Let us show

that we love the Church because it is His body—and Sacraments, because they are the bonds of our fellowship with Him, the very and true communication of Himself to us.

There is, however, another and much higher form of affirmation than by words, and that is by action. If we do not live the Truth we may spare to preach it. Men believe our lives, not our sermons. It is worse than folly to call the Church divine, and not to trust it; to claim a commission from Apostles and not to confide in it against all the world. It is by the deep, calm conviction of our own hearts—the reality and weight of our own lives—that we shall, under God, win souls. My Reverend Brethren, it is not for me to dwell on such things to you; it is not for me to tell you that our work *is* what we *are;* that to do we must be; that the weakest among us—penetrated with the majesty of the ever-blessed Trinity, kindled by the love of our Redeemer, and living under the guidance of the Holy Spirit—does more in the kingdom of Christ than cold hearts, albeit they have all knowledge and the tongue of Angels.

We have begun, I trust, to affirm, by real and unequivocal action, the laws and order of Christ's kingdom. Who will deny this character to the missions of the Church of England—to its Episcopate in foreign lands—to the Bishopric of New Zealand—to the works of education during the last ten years, and to the College of St. Augustine, in Canterbury? It is in

this strength—neither leaning on Civil powers nor opposing them—unfolding and thereby multiplying the gifts of God which are in us; not withdrawing from old relations, but acting for ourselves as if they did not exist, that we shall preach the kingdom of God.

There is another reason for this duty of positive teaching and action—I mean the evident fact that the chief contest now waging in the world is not so much between Christian Communions, between perfect and imperfect faith, between more or less of truth, but between faith and unbelief; between loyalty to a Master unseen, and licence of the individual will. On the one side is Christianity, on the other Rationalism, Deism, Pantheism, Socialism, Infidelity —the true Antichrist, feigning to be the Redeemer of man from slavery, superstition, priestcraft, plunging nations into bloodshed and apostacy. It is a conflict between those who believe anything, and those who believe nothing; those who have any faith to affirm, and those whose whole creed is to deny.

The divisions of the Church are the weakness of truth and the strength of falsehood. It is because Christians are divided that Antichrist prevails. Our schisms are his masteries: we betray our trust while we pretend to strive for it, because we strive among ourselves.

And lastly, to make an end, let us strive to speak and live in a larger spirit of charity. If we have more truth than others, let us show it by more

love. Less love is no token of more truth. This applies first to our internal oppositions. I do not say that all are verbal, or all easy to be healed: far from it; but it may be said without fear, that not even a verbal difference can be healed by breaches of charity, and that with charity even substantial contradictions melt into agreement. Wherefore let us strive, against all repulses, to show this spirit of enduring love to our separated brethren. Distance and controversy have been well tried in times past, and with what result? If we may not win them to be one with us, we may, at least, show equity and charity in the treatment of their persons, and in the exposition of their tenets. What is gained to truth, or to Him who is Truth, by making out men worse than they are, or branding them with marks which they, with us, abhor? Surely, if we love our Lord, we shall love them for whom He died, and if we love them we shall long and pray to find the least of error and the most of truth even in those points where we seem to be opposed. If those who are scattered abroad are ever to be gathered in; if the Church on earth is ever to be again united; if infidelity is ever to be cast out, and the faith of the Eternal Son, incarnate and crucified, reigning and coming again, ever to be spread throughout the earth, it must be through the same power which brought Him from the throne of God, the love which was in Him—living, witnessing, suffering in us; enduring

unfair treatment; loving good in all; cherishing the faintest gleam of truth; strengthening the things which remain; bearing long; and breaking finally with none who do not break first with God.

By the will of God we have been put in charge with the pastoral care of His flock in this land. Who can say what He has in store for them and us? They are our special charge. Our work henceforward is not with the few, with those whose hands hold the gifts and powers of the world, but with the poor of Christ, the multitude which have been this long time with us and now faint by the way; with the masses in mines and factories, herding in the desolation of crowded cities, or hurried onward in the train of deceivers and seducers. To win the tumultuous will of this great people to the unity and sanctity of Christ's kingdom is the work before us, a work worthy of life and death. It is not for no purpose that He has endowed the people of this soil with such stern sincerity, severe justice, depth of self-control, resistless force of will. Be it that these are mere endowments of the natural stock. What a material is there to receive the supernatural graft of faith. Let who doubts it read of our past, and he may conceive somewhat of the future. If our gifts are great, so are our sins, as the sins of all great people; but there is material for a great repentance, a great restitution, and a great obedience to the kingdom of God. Surely we already see it working

on every side. The end of this great empire is not politics or commerce; neither will its soul be satisfied therewith. It is to serve the kingdom of God. All things tell us that we are touching upon the first springs of a new providential movement in the mystery of the Church. The races which once bore the foremost mission in its service are grown feeble, and are of the past. The call has come to us. It is now our turn to bear the burden and the heat of the day. What may we not hope at home and abroad? Our mission is to the people of England; to those who speak the Saxon tongue in all the world; through them to the generations of mankind. Only let us confide in principles which come from God, and leave the event to Him. Let us not be out of heart at signs and scars of evil. If His visage was marred, why not also His body? To them who believe the Divine element in the Church to be imperishable, it is no cause of fear to see the human element which clothes it bear the marks of a fallen world. "Terra dedit fructum suum." The regeneration will not be perfect till "the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory." No amount of practical corruption in individuals or in masses of men can destroy that which is eternal. The visible Church has its periods of health and sickness; it may be that at this time, as in all times from the age of Apostles until now, as in all Churches from that in Corinth to our own, "many are sickly and weak among us, and

many sleep." We know in whom we have believed; and these things weigh nothing against the perception of His presence, which has opened upon us from our earliest consciousness unto this hour, shedding upon us the illumination of His truth and the effusions of His Spirit. To us the visible Church is not a name, an abstraction of the mind, much less a creation of man, but a symbol and a sacrament of Divine Spirit and Life, uniting us to the presence, love, and power of God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. In this divine faith let us live and labour, fearing God, and with no other fear, waiting for Him who shall be Judge of all at His coming and His kingdom.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

LONDON:
Printed by WILLIAM CLOWES and SONS,
Stamford Street.

BX
5034
M35
1948

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
CLAREMONT, CA
91711

10/03

DEMCO